

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

DATE MAILED: 09/25/2006

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/662,621	09/15/2003	Michael S. Williams	9362-4	9764	
20792	7590 09/25/2006	0 09/25/2006		EXAMINER	
MYERS BIO	GEL SIBLEY & SAJO 28	LEVY, NEIL S			
RALEIGH, 1	- •		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1615		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/662,621	WILLIAMS ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	NEIL LEVY	1615
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet w	vith the correspondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statut Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailir earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUN 136(a). In no event, however, may a will apply and will expire SIX (6) MO e, cause the application to become A	ICATION. reply be timely filed  NTHS from the mailing date of this communication. BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
Responsive to communication(s) filed on  2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☑ This  3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowated closed in accordance with the practice under the second secon	s action is non-final. ance except for formal ma	•
Disposition of Claims		
4)  Claim(s) 27-49 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrage 5)  Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6)  Claim(s) 27-49 is/are rejected. 7)  Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8)  Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or comparison.	wn from consideration.	
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine	or.	
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acceptable and acceptable acceptable and acceptable ac	cepted or b) objected to drawing(s) be held in abeyant on its required if the drawing	nce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). g(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureat * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	ts have been received. ts have been received in A prity documents have beer u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	Application No  n received in this National Stage
Attachment(s)  1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No	Summary (PTO-413) (s)/Mail Date Informal Patent Application

Art Unit: 1615

## **DETAILED ACTION**

The final rejection is withdrawn, and the following rejections are entered, & reinstated.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 27-49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as based on a disclosure which is not enabling. A description of what is meant by MASKING, critical or essential to the practice of the invention, but not included in the claim(s) is not enabled by the disclosure. See *In re Mayhew*, 527 F.2d 1229, 188 USPQ 356 (CCPA 1976).

Masking is stated to be known but no example or identification of the masking techniques as to how they were used by applicant as applied to the claimed polymeric non-erodible or erodible ,materials, to provide prosthesis, is evident.

The specification (pages 8 and 9) identifies the same polymers as erodible and non-erodible-polyacrylates, polyesters, PET ( a polyester, not specifically defined or otherwise identified in the specification, but assumed to be a polyester). There is nothing in the specification that supports the same polymer as erodible & non erodible; in fact, we find no time lines associated with erodible; all materials are erodible , given enough time, & the lack of differentiation between applicant's polymers.

Claims 27- 38,46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Art Unit: 1615

Absent a clear presentation of MASKING in the specification, it is not possible to determine the meets & bounds of the claimed invention, as the term is open to multiple interpretations.

Page 3

Claims 27-49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over BAWA et al 6071439.

BAWA reports use of the instant intraluminal prostheses (column 6, lines 14-28) inclusive of intraocular lenses, surgical devices, heart valves, intrauterine devices. surgical implants, artificial ureters, vessel substitutes (the instant stents), catheters. mouth guards, denture liners, and intraocular devices. Instant claims to portions of the prostheses of erodible polymers of hydrogel polyacrylate, polyethylene glycol. polycarbonate are met by the monomers of which BAWA's polymers are made (column 3, lines 4, 5, and 14-48). In vivo use is possible after supercritical carbon dioxide (SCF) extraction of alcohol and hydrophobic elements, the instant toxins (column 4, lines 49-67) and shown to be 10 times better than conventional toxin extraction. Example 1. Table 1, shows one in the art can vary the temperature and pressure to optimize toxin removal, and SCF removal (purge). Purging of SCF/toxins would result in toxin removal as the SCF returns to gas state. Operations are in enclosed chambers. Added cosolvents are used in spiking (column 4, lines 11-22), and known to one in SCF technology. Specifying coatings is not evident, but there is recognition of films (column 6, lines 10-17) and one in the art would obviously include prostheses coatings as part of the fabrication process.

Masking is seen as the plasma treatment (Example 3B) followed by SCF with resultant removal of toxins. Note the instant specification provides no identification of what constitutes the masking process; BAWA indicates plasma treatment incorporates oxygen into prostheses, while SCF removes residual solvents.

Claims 27-49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over HILE et al '2000 in view of COOK et al 5916585.

Although the PLGA (2.1 of page 178) prostheses of HILE are not stated to be intraluminal, the polymers, drug delivery functionality and SCF treatment are the same as of the instant invention. PLGA (column 9, bottom) is known to be used in intraluminal prostheses, as shown by COOK (column 6, lines 44-50) as a coating of a stent (Example 24).

Application/Control Number: 10/662,621

Art Unit: 1615

Example 19 shows coatings of PGLA. Masking is seen as the PEI coating followed by drug grafting. Solvents and residuals are not addressed. Given HILE, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the instant invention, producing the Cook implantables, to use SCF to remove solvents and residual materials from prostheses made or coated with PLGA, since HILE shows adjustment of time of extraction (page 183) can remove as much of the solvents as needed to provide suitable in vivo prostheses.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to NEIL LEVY whose telephone number is 571-272-0619. The examiner can normally be reached on Tuesday-Friday, 7 AM to 5:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, MICHAEL WOODWARD can be reached on 571-272-8373. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Page 5

NEIL LEVY Primary Examiner Art Unit 1615